

REMARKS

Formal drawings are submitted in response to objections set forth in the "Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review". Reexamination and reconsideration of the application, as amended, are respectfully requested.

The informal drawings originally filed were objected to by the Draftsperson on the basis on poor quality and uniformity of lines and reference characters. These defects are corrected in the accompanying formal drawings. No additional matter has been added to the new drawings. It is believed that the new drawings comply with 37 CFR §1.84.

Examiner has rejected Claims 1-16 under 35 USC §103 as being unpatentable over Keitoku (US5036188) in view of Crimmins (US5103108), Haddock (US4912880), and/or Takahashi (US4921330). The rejections are overcome since it is believed that Claims 1-16 patentably distinguish over Keitoku, Crimmins, Haddock, and Takahashi, for the reasons set forth hereinbelow.

In particular, Examiner has stated

Keitoku does not explicitly disclose purchasing or selling the hemispheric lens for retrofitting the remote-controlled electronic retail entertainment device. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to preassmble and/or distribute the lens of Keitoku in view of Crimmins in "kit" form to an end user because such is conventional in general to save assembly costs. Such assembly from a "kit" would define "retro-fitting" as set out in the claims. Additionally, it would have been obvious to obtain those items by a retail purchase or sale because that is a conventional method of obtaining electronic devices and replacement parts for such devices, which could include a lens assembly as set forth previously.

Applicant respectfully submits that it is not conventional to provide retail electronic entertainment devices *that include infrared remote control* in "kit" form. Applicant is unaware of any examples of such devices available in kit form. Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner either provide an affidavit pursuant to 37 CFR §1.104(d)(2) supporting the assertion that it is conventional to provide such devices in kit form, or withdraw the rejection.

Examiner further asserts that assembly from a kit is equivalent to retro-fitting. Applicant respectfully disagrees. The term retro-fitting, as set forth in the specification and recited in the claims, specifically refers to a scenario wherein a retail electronic entertainment device has been previously (and therefore separately) purchased, and then the lens assembly purchased and installed on the device by the end user. In equating assembly from a kit with retro-fitting, Examiner has improperly redefined the term retro-fitting as set forth in the claims. Accordingly, the rejection is improper and should be withdrawn.

Examiner further asserts that retail purchase is "a conventional method of obtaining electronic devices and replacement parts for such devices." Applicant respectfully submits that this assertion is not relevant to the present invention as claimed. The lens assembly in question is neither an electronic device, nor is it a replacement part. The lens assembly set forth in the claims is an add-on item, not a replacement part.

In view of the above, it is submitted that Claims 1-16 are in condition for allowance. Reconsideration of the rejections and objections is requested. Allowance of Claims 1-16 at an early date is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,



David S. Alavi
3762 West 11th Ave.
#408
Eugene, OR 97402

Reg. No. 40,310
541-686-9462 voice
800-853-6150 fax
dalavi@northwestpatent.com